



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,781	03/03/2004	Byoung Yull Yang	1594.1334	3217

21171 7590 01/10/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

LU, JIPING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3749

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/790,781	YANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jiping Lu	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-29 and 31-35 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 and 31-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14, 16-18 and 25-29 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24 is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. This application contains claims 1-7, 31-35 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. filed 8/17/04. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 calls for two ducts to supply air to the clothes chamber at two different pressures. However, according to specification, the air from both ducts 112, 302 are supplied from a single air source 218. It is not seen how the pressure could be different between two ducts.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hachiman et al. (Japanese patent publication No. 2002-85898) in view of Taylor et al. (U. S. Pat.

Art Unit: 3749

6,312,507) or Sun et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

Hachiman et al. show a clothes dryer with accommodating chamber 6, a duct (not numbered, between 2 and 6) to supply heated air into the chamber 6, a duct (not numbered, between 3 and 6) for supply ozone into the chamber 6, a chamber heater 2, a chamber ozonizer 3, and a controller 4 to control the heater 2 and ozonizer 3. However, Hachiman et al. do not show an ozonizer for automatically supplying ozone into the chamber when the detected odor is greater than an odor reference value and an ozone disposer to remove ozone from the air. Taylor et al. teach a concept of using a sensor for detecting the odor and activating the ion generator when sensed odor exceeds a predetermined value same as claimed (see abstract). Sun et al. teach a concept of using a sensor 13 for detecting the odor and automatically activate ozone generator 17 based on the detected contamination extent same as claimed. Watanabe or Hiromachi teaches a concept of using ozone filter 3 for removing ozone in the exhausted air same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the clothes dryer of Hachiman et al. with an odor sensor and to automatically control the ozonizer based on the detected odor value as taught by Taylor et al. or Sun et al. and to further provide the clothes dryer of Hachiman et al. with an ozone disposer as taught by Watanabe or Hiromachi in order to improve the cleaning efficiency.

5. Claims 14, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dhaemers (U. S. Pat. 5,546,678) in view of Taylor et al. (U. s. pat. 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

Dhaemers shows a clothes dryer comprising a chamber 608, a humidifier (Col. 3, lines 14-16), a heater 628, a blower 624 for circulating an atmosphere of the chamber, a filter 623 positioned between the chamber 608 and the blower 624, sensor 112, 113 and a control unit 635 which are arranged same as claimed. However, Dhaemers does not show an ozonizer and an ozonizer disposer and a control unit for automatically controlling the ozonizer based on the detected odor. Taylor et al. teach a concept of using a sensor for detecting the odor and activating the ion generator when sensed odor exceeds a predetermined value same as claimed (see abstract). Sun et al. teach a concept of using a sensor 13 for detecting the odor and automatically activate ozone generator 17 based on the detected contamination extent same as claimed. Watanabe or Hiromachi teaches a concept of using ozone filter 3 for removing ozone in the exhausted air same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the dryer of Dhaemers with an ozonizer and an odor sensor and to automatically control the ozonizer based on the detected odor value as taught by Taylor et al. or Sun et al. and to further provide the clothes dryer of Dhaemers with an ozone disposer as taught by Watanabe or Hiromachi in order to improve the cleaning efficiency.

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dhaemers (U. S. Pat. 5,546,678) in view of Taylor et al. (U. s. pat. 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Eisen (U. S. Pat. 5,940,988) or Ou (U. s. Pat. 5,555,640).

The clothes dryer of Dhaemers as modified by Taylor et al. or Sun et al. and Watanabe or Hiromachi as above includes all that is recited in claim 29 except for the door with transparent

Art Unit: 3749

window. Eisen teaches a clothes dryer with a door 56 having window 60 for viewing the chamber interior from outside same as claimed. Ou ('640) teaches a clothes dryer with a door 15 having window 153 for viewing the chamber interior from outside same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the clothes dryer of Dhaemers to include a door with windows as taught by Eisen or Ou in order to view the chamber interior from outside.

7. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ou (U. S. Pat. 5,755,040) in view of Taylor et al. (U. s. pat. 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

Ou shows a clothes dryer 1 with a clothes chamber 3, a first air duct G, a second air duct D, a chamber air heater 21, a plurality of vents 161, a door 15 with window which are arranged in the same manner as the broad claims. However, Ou does not show an ozonizer, an ozone disposer and a control unit for automatically controlling the ozonizer based on the detected odor. Taylor et al. teach a concept of using a sensor for detecting the odor and activating the ion generator when sensed odor exceeds a predetermined value same as claimed (see abstract). Sun et al. teach a concept of using a sensor 13 for detecting the odor and automatically activate ozone generator 17 based on the detected contamination extent same as claimed. Watanabe or Hiromachi teaches a concept of using ozone filter 3 for removing ozone in the exhausted air same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the clothes dryer of Ou with an ozonizer and an odor sensor and to automatically control the ozonizer based on the detected odor value as taught by

Taylor et al. or Sun et al. and to further provide the clothes dryer of Ou with an ozone disposer as taught by Watanabe or Hiromachi in order to improve the cleaning efficiency.

8. Claims 14, 16-18, 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ou (U. S. Pat. 5,755,040) in view of Dhaemers (U. S. Pat. 5,546,678) and Taylor et al. (U. s. pat. 6,312,507) or Sun et al. (U. S. Pat. 6,447,731) and Watanabe (JP02-087175) or Hiromachi (JP 2002-282346).

Ou shows a clothes dryer 1 with a clothes chamber 3, a first internal air duct G, a second external air duct 2, a chamber air heater 21, a plurality of vents 161, a door 15 with window which are arranged in the same manner as claimed. However, Ou does not show a humidifier, an ozonizer, an ozone disposer and a control unit for automatically controlling the ozonizer based on the detected odor. Dhaemers teaches a clothes dryer with a humidifier for supply moisture to the internal chamber same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the clothes dryer of Ou with a humidifier as taught by Dhaemers in order to supply moisture to the internal chamber. Taylor et al. teach a concept of using a sensor for detecting the odor and activating the ion generator when sensed odor exceeds a predetermined value same as claimed (see abstract). Sun et al. teach a concept of using a sensor 13 for detecting the odor and automatically activate ozone generator 17 based on the detected contamination extent same as claimed. Watanabe or Hiromachi teaches a concept of using ozone filter 3 for removing ozone in the exhausted air same as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the clothes dryer of Ou with an ozonizer and an odor sensor and to automatically control the ozonizer based on the detected odor value as taught by

Taylor et al. or Sun et al. and to further provide the clothes dryer of Ou with an ozone disposer as taught by Watanabe or Hiromachi in order to improve the cleaning efficiency.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 19-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome the rejection. First, broad claims presented fail to structurally define over the prior art references. The applicant is urged to point out from the claims if any limitations that the prior art references do not teach or show. Each and every claim element is fully shown by the collective teachings of the references. Therefore, claims remain unpatentable over the prior art references. Second, with regard to claims 8, 13, 14, the applicant argued that there is no teaching to combine the prior art references. The examiner disagrees with the applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21



Art Unit: 3749

USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the patent to Hachiman et al. shows a clothes dryer with accommodating chamber 6, a duct (not numbered, between 2 and 6) to supply heated air into the chamber 6, a duct (not numbered, between 3 and 6) for supply ozone into the chamber 6, a chamber heater 2, a chamber ozonizer 3, and a controller 4 to control the heater 2 and ozonizer 3. Taylor et al. teach a concept of using a sensor for detecting the odor and activating the ion generator when sensed odor exceeds a predetermined value same as claimed (see abstract). Sun patent teaches a concept of using a sensor 13 for detecting the odor and automatically activate ozone generator 17 based on the detected contamination extent same as claimed. Patents to Watanabe and Hiromachi teach a concept of using ozone filter 3 for removing ozone in the exhausted air same as claimed. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of the references, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art that would have been obvious to provide the clothes dryer of Hachiman et al. with an odor sensor and to automatically control the ozonizer based on the detected odor value as taught by Taylor et al. or Sun et al. and to further provide the clothes dryer of Hachiman et al. with an ozone disposer as taught by Watanabe or Hiromachi in order to improve the cleaning efficiency. Third, it should be noted that the broad claims merely include a combination of conventional elements in clothes dryer art. The prior art references as applied clearly show such well known features. Fourth, the arguments based on the 35 USC 112 are not persuasive. Claim 9 calls a clothes dryer with "a first duct to supply air of first pressure into the chamber, a second duct to supply air of second pressure into the chamber; .... wherein the first pressure is higher than the second pressure". It is very clear that applicant claimed a clothes dryer with a first duct supplying air at a higher pressure than the air supplied by the second duct. There is no support in the disclosure that shows the pressure between the two ducts

are different, i.e. the first duct to supply air of a first higher pressure only and the second duct to supply the air of second lower pressure only. The so-called unlimiting embodiment of Fig. 3 fails to disclose such claimed features. Finally, the applicant's arguments (page 12, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph) regarding the Dhaemers' failure to teach the use of a conventional humidifier in a clothes drying application are also not persuasive to overcome the rejection against the broad claims presented. The broad claims merely call for a humidifier selectively supplies moisture to the chamber. Dhaemers clearly teaches the supply of moisture to the drying chamber same as claimed. The drying chamber of Dhaemers is capable of accommodate an article of clothing. Based on the entirety of the Dhaemers patent, it can not be said that Dhaemers patent teaches away from using a conventional humidifier in a drying operation. Applicant is urged to amend the broad claims to structurally define over the prior art references of record.

### *Conclusion*

**11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,


Art Unit: 3749

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jiping Lu whose telephone number is 571 272 4878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EHUD GARTENBERG can be reached on 571 272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jiping Lu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3749

J. L.